

On a **MOTION** by Mike McDowell and **SECONDED** by Jake Nunnemacher, it was **UNANIMOUSLY** voted to **approve** Goscniak’s proposal to replace the “Existing Bathroom Window” and “Existing Window Over Kitchen Sink” with flush-mounted, 90 minute fire-rated windows that are either non-operable or equipped with fusible link shutters, to relocate the Dryer Vent and to install fire dampers with fusible links for the Range and Oven Vents.

3. **Case Number :** 16-1608
Appellant: Douglas Anderson for Xenia Hotels & Resorts, Inc.
Address of Property: 565 Newbury Street, Boston, MA.
Summary of Case: This appeal concerned a variance from 780 CMR (*The State Building Code, Eighth Edition*) Section 406.2.2, with respect to the heights of an automatic fire sprinkler system supply lines in a new parking garage, part of a six-story, mixed use building containing hotel rooms and function spaces.

On a **MOTION** by Jake Nunnemacher, and **SECONDED** by Mike McDowell, it was **UNANIMOUSLY** voted to **GRANT** a variance from **780 CMR 406.2.2**, on condition that Appellant must provide caution signage and markings on the sprinkler supply lines to make their locations obvious to pedestrians in the garage

4. **Case Number:** 16-1609
Appellant: Douglas Anderson for GEGC 2 New Street, LLC
Address of Property: 6 New Street, East Boston, MA.
Summary of Case: This appeal concerned a variance from 780 CMR (*The State Building Code, Eighth Edition*) Section 1021.1, with respect to the construction of a roof deck for a 17-story, 200’ multi-family apartment building with garage located at 6-26 New Street, Boston, MA.

On a **MOTION** by Mike McDowell, and **SECONDED** by Robert Anderson, it was a **TWO TO ONE VOTE** to **GRANT** a variance from **780 CMR 1021.1**, on condition that Appellant provide to both ISD and the Board a written plan that sets forth how the maximum occupant load of 49 will be ensured.

5. **Case Number :** 16-1610
Appellant: Daniel Picciano for Stephen Mason
Address of Property: 1220 Market Street, Lynnfield, MA. 01940
Summary of Case: This appeal concerned a variance from 780 CMR (*The State Building Code, Eighth Edition*) Section 1301.1.1, and 2012 IECC (*International Energy Conservation Code*) C402.4.7, with respect to the entrance to a proposed store.

On a **MOTION** by Mike McDowell, and **SECONDED** by Jake Nunnemacher, it was **UNANIMOUSLY** voted to **GRANT** a variance from **2012 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC)**, as adopted and amended by Massachusetts as part of the 8th Edition of the State Building Code, pursuant to **780 CMR 1301.1.1**, and **2012 IECC C402.4.7**.

6. **Case Number:** 16-1612
Appellant: Donald Havener for Savin Hill Partners
Address of Property: 112-120 Savin Hill Avenue, Dorchester, MA. 02125

Summary of Case: This appeal concerned a variance from 780 CMR (*The State Building Code, Eighth Edition*) Section 705.8, 705.8.1, with respect to the construction of an addition, consisting of 14 residential units and once commercial space, to an existing building.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit 1. Application dated February 25, 2016 and received on February 26, 2016.

Exhibit 2. Set of plans of 112-120 Savin Hill Ave, 6 pages.

On a **MOTION** by Jake Nunnemacher, and **SECONDED** by Mike McDowell, it was **UNANIMOUSLY** voted to **GRANT** variances from **780 CMR 705.8, 705.8.1**, on conditions that Appellant provide automatic fire sprinkler coverage in all openings in accordance with ISD's requirements; fire sprinkler coverage must be installed on the exterior balconies; and these sprinkler requirements must be set forth in the deed for the property, to ensure that the requirements are memorialized and all future owners are aware of the requirements.

7. **Case Number :** 16-1613
Appellant: Raymond Correira for Eric Mautner
Address of Property: 101 Somerset Avenue, Taunton, MA. 02780
Summary of Case: The Appellant sought an interpretation of whether certain construction of fire escape structures for an existing building (located at 101 Somerset Avenue, Taunton, MA) constituted a "repair" under the State Building Code.

On a **MOTION** by Jake Nunnemacher, and **SECONDED** by Mike McDowell, we considered a motion to interpret that these particular circumstances do **not** constitute a "repair" as defined by the Code; that Appellant must work with the City to determine what steps are necessary to bring the new fire escape structures into compliance with the Building Code.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.